

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Black Sheep, Outsiders, and the Qumran Movement : Social-Psychological Perspectives on Norm-Deviant Behaviour

Jokiranta, Jutta Maria

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht
2016

Jokiranta , J M 2016 , Black Sheep, Outsiders, and the Qumran Movement :
Social-Psychological Perspectives on Norm-Deviant Behaviour . in S Byrskog , R Hakola & J
Jokiranta (eds) , Social Memory and Social Identity in the Study of Early Judaism and Early
Christianity . Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht , pp. 151-173 . <https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666593758.151>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/217501>
<https://doi.org/10.13109/9783666593758.151>

submittedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

Jutta Jokiranta

Black Sheep, Outsiders, and the Qumran Movement: Social-Psychological Perspectives on Norm-Deviant Behaviour

Introduction

The term “black sheep effect” in social psychological research was coined by José Marques and his colleagues in the 1980s to describe the phenomenon in which ingroup norm-deviance is viewed more harshly than the corresponding behaviour of outgroup members. Deviant ingroup members present a challenge to the positive identity of the ingroup which has to be somehow resolved.¹ “Outgroup homogeneity effect”, on the other hand, refers to the social identity process whereby outgroup members are perceived to be more similar to each other than ingroup members among themselves, and the perception of the outgroup is often coloured by the most negative stereotype available.² In this article, I will ask if markers of these phenomena can be identified in the *Community Rule* of Qumran and what significance these social psychological processes have for our understanding of this particular rule text and, more broadly, the Qumran movement.

In general, identity is based on perceptions of sameness and difference. I assume that the gathering of people around common ideals of studying, providing counsel, worshipping and/or having meals together already established a shared ingroup identity for the people we may call the Qumran movement. In recent research, even the “sectarian” scrolls are no longer seen as reflective of only one strict community living on the shore of the Dead Sea, but rather of a wide socio-religious movement with internal variation and change.³

¹ J.M. Marques/V.Y. Yzerbyt/J.-P. Leyens, “The ‘Black Sheep Effect’: Extremity of Judgments towards Ingroup Members as a Function of Group Identification”, *EJSP* 18 (1988) 1–16.

² P.J. Oakes/S.A. Haslam/J.C. Turner (ed.), *Stereotyping and Social Reality* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), 160–85.

³ E.g. C. Wassén/J. Jokiranta, “Groups in Tension: Sectarianism in the Damascus Document and the Community Rule”, in D.J. Chalcraft (ed.), *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances* (London: Equinox, 2007) 205–45; John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009); A. Schofield, *From Qumran*

When studying the identity of its members, it matters a great deal whether we imagine a group of people who lived together and whose everyday life in all details was governed by the sect, or a socio-religious movement based on small group gatherings and comprised of people who came together on a regular basis – perhaps in some cases only annually – and who basically led their life as families among other families.⁴ If we pursue this task on the basis of the textual evidence, especially the rule documents like the *Community Rule*, the *Damascus Document*, and others, we have no reason to think that this movement was a small isolated community of people living and working in only one place. Rather, the movement seems to have been based on small groups coming together and also regulating the life of members outside of the assembly setting, and perhaps during larger, more infrequent meetings. The movement rules are first and foremost about *assembling* and sharing knowledge, not about *communal units/enclaves*.⁵ This is a claim based on textual data. The members probably lived scattered around the land, and they needed to create forms of negotiating their identity among themselves and among outsiders. The study of the movement and the identity of its members no longer assumes a communal setting where all members lived, but rather a network setting where members created firm and established contacts but continued their (family) life.

The *Community Rule* (= *Serekh Ha-Yahad* [S]) is a title given by scholars to a handful of manuscripts, most notably the well-preserved Cave 1 manuscript 1QS (dated around 100–75 BCE) and various types of manuscripts from Cave 4 and 5, 4QS^{a-j} (4Q255–264) and 5QS (5Q11).⁶ The naming can be somewhat

to the *Yahad*: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for The *Community Rule* (STDJ 77; Leiden: Brill, 2009); J. Jokiranta, *Social Identity and Sectarianism in the Qumran Movement* (STDJ 105; Leiden: Brill, 2013); C. Hempel, *The Qumran Rule Texts in Context: Collected Studies* (TSAJ 154; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013). In this research, scholars have addressed different questions, such as the relationship between different documents (the *Damascus Document* and the *Community Rule*; the rule documents and the *pesharim*), the development within one literary tradition, and the relationship between shorter and longer *Community Rule* manuscripts, but the important thing to note is that even the most sectarian documents are not seen as reflective of one community only.

⁴ The question of celibacy in the movement is debated. Recently, C. Wassén, “Women, Worship, Wilderness, and War: Celibacy and the Constructions of Identity in the Dead Sea Scrolls”, in J. Baden, et al. (ed.), *Festschrift in Honor of John J. Collins* (Leiden: Brill, forthcoming), shows that the scholarly models presented as the rationale for celibacy are mostly mistaken.

⁵ See further J. Jokiranta, “An Experiment on *Idem* Identity in the Qumran Movement”, *DSD* 16, no. 3 (2009) 309–29. A. van der Kooij, “The *Yahad* – What is in a Name?”, *DSD* 18, no. 2 (2011) 109–28, argues that the term *yahad* itself points to a type of national assembly.

⁶ P.S. Alexander/G. Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4 XIX: 4QSerekh Ha-Yahad* (DJD 26; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998); S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997); S. Metso, *The Serekh Texts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 9; London: T&T Clark, 2007). Other manuscripts are closely related, but named differently (e.g. 5Q13: *5QCiting the Community Rule* or *5Q(Sectarian) Rule*); see the discussion on manuscript variation by J. Jokiranta and H. Vanonen, “Multiple Copies of Rule Texts or Multiple Rule Texts? Boundaries of the S and M Documents”, in M.S. Pajunen/H. Tervanotko (ed.), *Crossing Imaginary Boundaries: The Dead Sea*

misleading, since none of the fragmentary remains of the 4QS and 5QS manuscripts preserve anything close to 1QS. Textual forms vary from manuscript to manuscript, and the inclusion and preservation of various textual sections vary greatly as well. We can safely say that no manuscript was identical to another, even though the fragmentary nature of the evidence does not allow us to be more specific about how. There is growing awareness that 1QS is in fact a quite unique manuscript, and although there is no consensus about its nature, it should be studied as an exemplar of existing rule traditions, not the only one, and perhaps not necessarily the major one.⁷ Thus, it is not assumed here that this manuscript is the most representative of the Qumran movement membership, yet it is still held that this manuscript, along with other rule manuscripts, reflects some of the *promoted* contours and dynamics of membership, and it is therefore a useful example to study in terms of the identity issues at hand.

Another methodological note is in order here. To study ingroup/outgroup differentiation is a social-psychological question and not directly a historical question of members and their opponents. What a manuscript like 1QS offers is foremost an ingroup (ideal) perspective, but on which ingroup(s) and which situations? Social identity is always context-dependent, varying in terms of levels of abstraction (e.g. human/non-human, male/female, educated/non-educated, full member/novice), and it reflects an individual's perception of him/herself as a group member. To grasp how a member of the Qumran movement may have identified him/herself⁸ in different situations and what was seen as most important in relation to social identity is another matter than reading about membership rules, ideals, and teachings, often in collectivizing language, as we are not even sure for which group and occasion this manuscript

Scrolls in the Context of Second Temple Judaism (PFES 108; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2015) 11–60.

⁷ J. Jokiranta, “What is ‘Serekh ha-Yahad (S)’? Thinking About Ancient Manuscripts as Information Processing”, in J. Baden, et al. (ed.), *Festschrift in Honor of John J. Collins* (Leiden: Brill, forthcoming); Charlotte Hempel, “The Long Text of the Serekh as Crisis Literature”, *RevQ* 27 (2015) 3–24. Already in *The Textual Development* (1997), Metso paid attention to the theological emphasis in 1QS. Traditionally, 1QS has been considered a model copy of some sort (e.g. D. Dimant, “The Composite Character of the Qumran Sectarian Literature as an Indication of Its Date and Provenance”, *RevQ* 22 (2006) 615–30), but it is actually striking that there are no other manuscripts strictly imitating 1QS. 4QS^b comes closest in terms of the amount of similar sections preserved. Many scholars have understood 1QS as an instruction primarily for the leaders of the movement who then instructed others; see C.A. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (STDJ 52; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 102–3. Newsom reads 1QS in terms of formation of “sectarian identity”, arguing that the “document’s function has more to do with formation than information” (p. 103).

⁸ Membership language in 1QS uses masculine forms and nouns, and I will discuss the issue in terms of this language when discussing the text passages. However, 1QSa and CD clearly reflect a family setting, and females had their obligations as well; see further C. Wassén, *Women in the Damascus Document* (Academica Biblica 21; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005).

was intended. Here we have to theorize on the basis of *imagined communities*, or *textualized identities*.⁹ We cannot get a full grasp of the sectarian identity in all possible situations. What we can get is texts that most probably sought to *achieve* further positive distinctiveness and stronger identification with the group. Thus, while social identity is not clearly and directly accessible through the textual evidence, to approach this evidence in terms of a social identity approach will raise new questions about the data and suggest new answers to the study of membership as well. It provides theoretical tools for thinking about the individual member (whose identity it was always about), the collective processes that have taken place over time, and the dynamism needed in order to talk about identity (being context-dependent, non-stable, and hierarchical) in the first place.

I will first study some central starting points from social identity research that provide basic concepts and a theoretical framework, starting with more fundamental issues (categorization and social cognition), moving towards more specific themes (outgroup homogeneity and the black sheep effect), and then analysing some of the S material in light of those perspectives.

Categorization

Categorization, including social categorization, is an ongoing human ability to make sense of the world. But what is it exactly and why does it take place? Revisiting this question, Penelope Oakes, Alexander Haslam, and John Turner argue that evidence is lacking for understanding categorization as simplifying information because of a limited capacity to process information.¹⁰ Instead, they propose that perception always entails categorizing. Abundant information is *meaningless* if not placed in classes: “Categorization gives a stimulus meaning through placement.”¹¹ Thus, categorization does not take place due to an overload of information, but because humans need *more* information than is available; categorization creates expectations about a stimulus, its properties and effects. By categorizing people into men or women, old or young, elite or not, rich or poor, religious or not, for example, humans obtain expectations of their behaviour. Categorization changes uncategorized stimuli into “objects and events with human relevance and elaborated meaning” at one level of abstraction.¹²

⁹ This can be compared to how R. Hakola, “The Burden of Ambiguity: Nicodemus and the Social Identity of the Johannine Christians”, *NTS* 55 (2009) 438–55, aims at understanding the *symbolic* world underlying the *textual* world of the Gospel of John.

¹⁰ Oakes, Haslam, and Turner (ed.), *Stereotyping and Social Reality*, 104–26.

¹¹ Oakes, Haslam, and Turner (ed.), *Stereotyping and Social Reality*, 108.

¹² Oakes, Haslam, and Turner (ed.), *Stereotyping and Social Reality*, 109.

Furthermore, there are no fixed, determined theories of the world that promote the salience of certain properties against some other properties. The salience emerges in the interaction between context-based categories (theories of the world seen apt for a certain situation and purpose) and real material properties in the environment. “Information is what the perceiver needs to know at any given moment in order to construct a meaningful representation of the reality, and to achieve their goals.”¹³ These perspectives are important for any study of human categories and social perception.

Social Cognition and Social Self

Social identity starts with categorization and perceiving oneself as more similar to one group of individuals than to another group of individuals: the differences with the outgroup members are greater than the differences among the ingroup members. In any given context, similarities between the ingroup members are regarded as greater and as more significant than their differences (accentuation of intragroup similarities and intergroup differences in terms of relevant properties).¹⁴ Social identity theory further claims that the *positive* aspects of social identities are inherently comparative in nature. In order to achieve positive social identity, members of the group compare themselves to outgroup members and show a biased perception of themselves (thus being selective in the accentuation effect).¹⁵

As positive distinctiveness is established, the group creates social *prototypes* that represent the desired behaviour of a group member. Group prototypes maximize the inside-outside differences. However, inside differences also begin to emerge when members are evaluated according to their similarity to the group prototype. These differences are needed in order to best maintain the maximal difference from the outgroup and a sense of superiority.

¹³ Oakes, Haslam, and Turner (ed.), *Stereotyping and Social Reality*, 113.

¹⁴ J.C. Turner, “Some Current Issues in Research on Social Identity and Self-Categorization Theories”, in N. Ellemers et al. (ed.), *Social Identity: Context, Commitment, Content* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999) 6–34, on pp. 10–11; J.M. Marques et al., “Social Categorization, Social Identification, and Rejection of Deviant Group Members”, in M.A. Hogg/S. Tindale (ed.), *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Group Processes. First published 2001* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003) 400–24, on p. 405. Social identity theorizing is based on pioneering work by Henri Tajfel; see H. Tajfel, *Human Groups and Social Categories: Studies in Social Psychology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

¹⁵ In light of these perspectives, the positive distinctiveness of a Qumran movement member in all likelihood was related to what degree that member compared the movement to other groups and identified with the movement, believing that social change was possible only through it. Members had different expectations for ingroup/outgroup members’ behaviour on the basis of categorization and group distinction, and rule texts like 1QS contributed to these types of expectations.

Outgroup Homogeneity Effect

Studies suggest that, in general, people have more varied information about their ingroup than about the outgroup. In other words, people perceive the outgroup as more homogenous than the ingroup.¹⁶ This is understandable as people are more familiar with the ingroup and can retrieve more information about it.¹⁷ However, the homogeneity effect appears both with the ingroup and the outgroup in an intergroup context, that is, when the ingroup is being compared to the outgroup. Only in an intragroup context, when the focus is not on comparison but on the ingroup itself, do the lower-level categories become available and people see more differences between the ingroup members.¹⁸

Black Sheep Effect

As noted above, according to the social identity theory, people are biased in their social evaluations and generally favour ingroup members against outgroup members. However, the black sheep effect seems to defy this tendency, as ingroup deviant behaviour is judged more harshly than corresponding behaviour by the outgroup. How can this be explained?

Overall, members have two options of how to react to ingroup deviance: either to downplay the meaning of the deviance or to derogate/punish the ingroup member (black sheep effect).¹⁹ Both strategies aim to interpret the deviant behaviour as not representative of ingroup behaviour overall. In the first option, undesired ingroup behaviour is often justified by external, situational

¹⁶ Oakes, Haslam, and Turner (ed.), *Stereotyping and Social Reality*, 160–85.

¹⁷ For the suggestion that information about ingroup deviance is also processed differently from outgroup deviance, see G. Reese/M.C. Steffens/K.J. Jonas, “When Black Sheep Make us Think: Information Processing and Devaluation of In- and Outgroup Norm Deviants”, *Social Cognition* 31, no. 4 (2013) 482–503.

¹⁸ Oakes, Haslam, and Turner (ed.), *Stereotyping and Social Reality*, 160–85. Furthermore, a small outgroup is depicted more negatively than a larger one, even though the relative amount of negative properties attached to their behaviours would be the same; see Oakes, Haslam, and Turner (ed.), *Stereotyping and Social Reality*, 174.

¹⁹ S. Otten/E.H. Gordijn, “Was It One of Us? How People Cope with Misconduct by Fellow Ingroup Members”, *SPPC* 8, no. 4 (2014) 165–77; M. Rullo/F. Presaghi/S. Livi, “Reactions to Ingroup and Outgroup Deviants: An Experimental Group Paradigm for Black Sheep Effect”, *PLoS ONE* 10, no. 5 (2015) 1–14, on p. 11. Rullo et al. are interested in asking if the black sheep effect produces only psychological, judgmental, and evaluative effects, or if it also increases aggressive reactions and behaviours.

reasons, whereas undesired outgroup behaviour is explained by dispositional (related to a person's character) reasons.²⁰ For the second option, let us look at the black sheep effect more closely. Typically, members of one's ingroup are judged more harshly than outgroup members. "People differentiate more strongly between likeable and unlikeable ingroup members than between likeable and unlikeable outgroup members."²¹ Even though members of the ingroup should generally be liked more than outgroup members, thus contributing to positive social identity (ingroup bias), deviant ingroup members cause a contradictory effect: since they risk the positive distinctiveness of the ingroup, they are disliked even more than outgroup members who might act in a similar way.²² Later research has sought to identify further criteria when this effect emerges.

Marques et al. make the distinction between *descriptive* (denotative) norms that generate intergroup differentiation and *prescriptive* norms according to which such differentiation is legitimated and evaluated. Descriptive norms define the group prototypes and "are framed by criteria that apply to both ingroup and outgroup".²³ In contrast, prescriptive norms regulate ingroup expectations. Such prescriptive norms are often more reflectively and consciously held. "Once intergroup distinctiveness is established by a denotative norm, ingroup members can devote attention to prescriptive norms that ensure consensus on criteria for positive ingroup evaluation."²⁴ If an ingroup member behaves against the expected ingroup norms, it creates a situation of confusion and raises the possibility that a non-deviant ingroup member has mistaken the relevant ingroup norms. It leads to heightened self-focus, whereby the member needs to monitor the valued norms, maintain those norms, and actively establish normative influence on deviant members – thus

²⁰ Otten/Gordijn, "Was It One of Us? How People Cope with Misconduct by Fellow Ingroup Members", 167. Typically, the positive behaviour of the ingroup member is explained by the person's positive character, whereas the positive behaviour of the outgroup member is explained by situational factors. And *vice versa*, the negative behaviour of the ingroup member is explained by situational factors, whereas the negative behaviour of the outgroup member is explained by their inherent properties.

²¹ J.M. Marques/D. Páez/D. Abrams, "Social Identity and Intragroup Differentiation as Subjective Social Control", in S. Worchel et al. (ed.), *Social Identity: International Perspectives* (London: Sage Publications, 1998) 124–41, on p. 129.

²² Deviant outgroup members are more likely to be taken as representatives of the entire outgroup (see discussion on outgroup homogeneity effect above), especially when ingroup social identity is threatened. There is also a correlation between the degree of identification with the ingroup and the willingness to include the undesirable (deviant) member in the representation of the outgroup. P. Hutchison et al. explain, "Including an undesirable member in the representation of the outgroup allows high identifiers to establish or maintain a positive distinction between the ingroup and the outgroup," P. Hutchison et al., "Getting Rid of the Bad Ones: The Relationship Between Group Identification, Deviant Derogation, and Identity Maintenance", *JESP* 44 no. 3 (2008) 874–81, on p. 880.

²³ Marques et al., "Social Categorization", 410.

²⁴ Marques et al., "Social Categorization", 411.

not only supervising distinction from the outgroup but also conformity to norms within the ingroup. “Derogation of ingroup deviants reinforces people’s commitment to the group.”²⁵ Research also suggests that the black sheep effect is not directed at deserting members who join the outgroup, but rather those deviant ingroup members who blur the ingroup/outgroup distinction.²⁶

Sabine Otten and Ernestine Gordijn integrate results from previous studies to suggest three sets of factors that play a role in evaluating the deviant ingroup member (either by excusing the member’s behaviour or by punishing the behaviour, such as by excluding the member).²⁷ The black sheep effect (i.e. judging undesired ingroup behaviour more harshly than the corresponding outgroup behaviour) is clearest when the norm-deviant ingroup behaviour is:

- 1) connected to ingroup-defining norms (rather than general behavioural norms that are shared by the ingroup and outgroup), and its intent is unambiguous,
- 2) performed by full members (rather than newcomers or marginal members), or by current or past leaders (rather than future leaders), or
- 3) judged by a member who identifies strongly with the ingroup (rather than by a member whose identification is weak) and who has cognitive resources to pass judgment (rather than a member whose cognitive capacity in the evaluation situation is occupied by other tasks).

On the contrary, deviant ingroup behaviour may be excused when: 1) it deals with general norms (“everyone can break that norm”) and its intent is ambiguous (“it was a mistake”), 2) it is performed by a newcomer (“who did not know any better”), a marginal member (“who is not really one of us”), or a future leader (“to change things, one is allowed some exceptions”), and 3) it is evaluated by a member whose identification with the ingroup is weak (“I do not really care”) or a member whose cognitive resources for evaluating the behaviour are limited (“I have other things on my mind”).

I will next turn to the 1QS evidence in search of possible signs of the black sheep effect. This first demands a quick look at the sections of 1QS: the cosmic discourse on two spirits (1QS 3:13–4:26) is a tradition in its own right and colours the portrayal of the world in 1QS as having sharp contrasts, light and darkness, truth and falsehood. However, it is possible to read other sections of 1QS without this cosmic duality, and most probably many of its traditions were

²⁵ Marques et al., “Social Categorization”, 417.

²⁶ G.A. Travaglino et al., “How groups react to Disloyalty in the Context of Intergroup Competition: Evaluations of Group Deserters and Defectors”, *JESP* 54 (2014) 178–87, on p. 184.

²⁷ Otten/Gordijn, “Was It One of Us? How People Cope with Misconduct by Fellow Ingroup Members”, 165–77.

not originally connected to that tradition.²⁸ For the most part, 1QS gives the impression that *internal* hierarchy and order were very important in the rules preserved. These rules are thus comparable to rules of voluntary association in general.²⁹ On the other hand, the liturgical framework of 1QS (the covenant renewal in the beginning, the hymn in the end) focuses on becoming a member, acting as an ideal member, and striving for an ever fuller understanding of what membership meant.

The discourse on the two spirits is omitted from this analysis as its ideological division is fairly abstract and the dualism can be approached from several angles (e.g. cosmic, ethical, anthropological).³⁰ It certainly invites members to identify with the right side, but it does not tell much about the nuances in between.³¹ More significant for our purposes here are those rules in 1QS that give more concrete advice about how to deal with deviant behaviour and how to maintain distance from outsiders. Again it must be kept in mind that even these rules are not windows into the members' behaviour, but rather instructions intended to affect their attitudes and behaviour.

²⁸ C. Hempel, "The Teaching on the Two Spirits and the Literary Development of the Rule of the Community", in G. Xeravits (ed.), *Dualism in Qumran* (LSTS 76; London: T&T Clark, 2010) 102–20; L.T. Stuckenbruck, "The Interiorization of Dualism within the Human Being in Second Temple Judaism: The Treatise of the Two Spirits (1QS III: 13–IV: 26) in Its Tradition-Historical Context", in A. Lange et al. (ed.), *Light against Darkness: Dualism in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and the Contemporary World* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011) 145–68.

²⁹ E.g. M. Weinfeld, *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect: A Comparison with Guilds and Religious Associations of the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (NTOA 2; Fribourg: Éditions universitaires, 1986); Y. Moynihan Gillihan, *Civic Ideology, Organization, and Law in the Rule Scrolls: A Comparative Study of the Covenanters' Sect and Contemporary Voluntary Associations in Political Context* (STDJ 97; Leiden Brill, 2012).

³⁰ J. Frey, "Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library: Reflections on their Background and History", in M. Bernstein, et al. (ed.), *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995* (STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997) 275–335.

³¹ One contrast in the two spirits teaching involves truth (אמת) and injustice (עולה). The latter term is especially frequent in 1QS 4:9, 17–24, where the perspective is future-oriented, anticipating a time when injustice will no longer be found and human deeds will be free of it. Note the form עולה, in comparison to the more frequent form עול (see below), possibly indicating a distinct tradition of עולה. This form is also used in a similar sense in the final hymn in the context of waiting for judgment day: "The multitude of people of the pit I shall not capture until the Day of Vengeance, yet my fury shall not abate from the people of injustice (מאנשי עולה), and I shall never be appeased until righteousness be established" (1QS 10:19–20). Freedom from sin is described in purity language in 1QS 4:20–22. This appears to me to be an eschatological vision, and it thus does not imply that all sins were seen as defiling. For the relationship between the two spirits teaching and 4QInstruction, see E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction* (STDJ 44; Leiden Brill, 2001) 194–207.

Deviant Behaviour in the Community Rule: When to Excuse and When not to?

The penal codes in the *Community Rule* (esp. 1QS 6–7; parallels in 4QSB^{b,d,g,e}) and elsewhere in the rule texts³² give information about non-normative types of behaviour in meetings and sometimes also outside the meeting context.³³ These penalties (temporary exclusion of non-reliable members and fines in the form of food reduction) were, in my view, most of all meant for maintaining order during meetings and trust in the reliability of collective counselling, but they probably also contributed to ingroup gradation: a member who often received penalties or received severe penalties was likely trusted less (i.e. there was a shaming effect involved).³⁴

The sections that deal with breaking more foundational rules of the movement are interesting for our purposes, since they go directly to the heart of ingroup/outgroup differentiation. Some of these rules can be seen as conforming to the dynamics of the black sheep effect and reflecting the desire to regulate attitudes about when and when not to excuse deviants.

According to 1QS 8:16b–19, a member who deviates needs to be examined again and then re-integrated back into communal activities and decision-making; this person is thus treated like an initiate.

No one belonging to the people of *yahad*, the covenant of the *yahad*, who flagrantly deviates from any commandment is to touch the purity belonging to the people of holiness. Further, he is not to participate in any of their deliberations until all his works have been cleansed from injustice (עוֹל), so that he is again able to walk blamelessly. They shall admit him into deliberations by the decision of the general membership; afterwards, he shall be enrolled at an appropriate rank. This is also the procedure for every initiate added to the *yahad*. (1QS 8:16b–19)³⁵

³² In particular, the *Damascus Document* has similar penal code material (CD 14:18–23; 4QD^a [4Q266] frgs. 10–11; 4QD^d [4Q269] frg. 11; 4QD^e [4Q270] frg. 7), as does the manuscript 4Q265 frg. 4.

³³ C. Hempel, “The Penal Code Reconsidered”, in M. Bernstein, et al. (ed.), *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995* (STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997) 337–48.

³⁴ J. Jokiranta, “Social Identity in the Qumran Movement: The Case of the Penal Code”, in P. Luomanen et al. (ed.), *Explaining Christian Origins and Early Judaism: Contributions from Cognitive and Social Science* (BibInt 89; Leiden: Brill, 2007) 277–89.

³⁵ Translations are based on E. Tov (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library: Texts and Images* (partially based on *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, edited by D.W. Parry/E. Tov, morphological analysis by M. Abegg, Jr., produced by N.B. Reynolds, associate producer K. Heal; Leiden: Brill, 2006), but include my modifications. I have chosen to translate אנשי as “people of” rather than “men of”, following C. Hempel, “The Community and Its Rivals According to the Community Rule from Caves 1 and 4”,

This seems to be a moderate or even lenient position: the deviant can be excused, though he must change his behaviour and still be excluded from the common purity (probably special meals but also other possessions governed by the movement) until appropriate conditions are met. This is noteworthy given the suggestion that he acted deliberately (“flagrantly”, lit. “with a high hand”). In a similar vein, the rules in 1QS 7:18b–21 first allow the deviant member “whose spirit deviates from the instruction of the *yahad*, so that he forsakes the truth and walks in the stubbornness of his heart” (1QS 7:18–19) to be re-established in his membership after repenting and going through a process of inquiry. The member is punished by exclusion for a time period and by being treated like a novice. These rules are thus comparable to the (other) penal code rules on deviating from assembly rules: the emphasis is on the function of the collective instruction (deliberations) of the members, not on distinguishing the members from outsiders. Anything that risks the natural flow of knowledge and authority of the counsel provided by the assemblies is discouraged by moderate penalties, exclusion, a ranking system, and the possibility of inquiry and reintegration.

However, directly after these rules, some additional conditions are found. The rule in 1QS 8:20–27 makes a distinction between an intentional sinner and an unintentional sinner against the Mosaic Laws – possibly referring to members who have passed their admission process since the language of “blameless holiness” is used of full members in 1QS 8:10–11. Only the unintentional sinner will be purified and granted the same chance as the initiate. The intentional sinner can never return, and none of the covenanters are to do any business with him. In comparison, 1QS 7:22–25 states that if the deviant member has been a member for ten full years, he must leave and never return, and no-one may share any pure things or possessions with him on pain of also being expelled.

The rules suggest that having a penal code of temporary exclusions and rules for the transgression of more foundational communal principles was insufficient: further distinctions needed to be made between types of deviance. The solutions offered distinguished between intentional sin and unintentional sin,³⁶ as well as between junior and senior members. The latter rule meant that

RevQ 81 (2003) 47–81. However, the masculine singular is the governing form in many rules, and these are translated by using the masculine “he”.

³⁶ The distinction in some part goes back to the sacrificial rules for unintentional sins (Lev 4; Num 15); see G.A. Anderson, “Intentional and Unintentional Sin in the Dead Sea Scrolls”, in D.P. Wright, et al. (ed.), *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995) 49–64, on p. 52. Anderson suggests that unintentional sins were connected to the category of “hidden laws”, that is, to *halakhah* that was not obvious to everyone but was continuously being revealed in the sect. The distinction is further elaborated by Philo; see e.g. *De posteritate Caini* 10–11, *De agricultura* 180, *De fuga et inventione* 86.

the more the member was regarded as belonging to the “inner” circles, the more harshly his transgression was to be viewed. These texts are silent about the corresponding behaviour of the outgroup members. There are no clear distinctions between intentional and unintentional sinners among the outgroup members.³⁷ Viewing the deviant behaviour of ingroup members negatively gives potential indications of the black sheep effect. Deviance was not excused since the non-normative behaviour was:

- 1) connected to ingroup-defining norms: the movement members had the ability to follow the instruction and *torah* as they were part of the counselling and revelation, whereas the outsiders did not;
- 2) its intent was unambiguous: done “intentionally” (by full members?) or performed by established members (having been members for ten years or more);
- 3) we may speculate that this deviant behaviour was judged in this manner by members of the movement (authors/editors of 1QS) who found themselves threatened (e.g. boundaries becoming blurred, defectors leaving the group, or competition of resources and followers between groups) and by members who identified strongly with the ingroup: thus the existence of these rules in 1QS reflects possible competition, defection, and a need for further inculcation of suitable attitudes.

There are also other rules in 1QS that potentially contribute to constructing especially negative attitudes towards undesired behaviour: cursing the insincere member (1QS 2:11–18) and deeming the purification and atonement of a person who refused to enter the covenant as non-effective (1QS 2:25–3:12).³⁸ It is possible that the annual covenant ritual, of which these rules are part, emerged

³⁷ Note that the black sheep effect in theory could also work in reverse – that is, a more positive perception of an ideal outgroup member than of a corresponding ingroup member – if the outgroup member supported the legitimacy of the ingroup norms. This is how Hakola, “The Burden of Ambiguity”, 438–55, interprets the character of Nicodemus in the Gospel of John. No markers of such effect are visible in the *Community Rule*, however.

³⁸ M. Himmelfarb, “Impurity and Sin in 4QD, 1QS, and 4Q512”, *DSD* 8, no. 1 (2001) 9–37, on pp. 30–31, explains that 1QS 2:25–3:12 is describing a person who has shown interest in joining but then refuses; the person is condemned with impurity language that goes beyond the language in Leviticus, rendering the outsider as permanently impure and sinful. However, the person can actually be an insider who refuses to participate in the covenant ritual and its discipline: “he rejects the laws of God, refusing to be disciplined in the *yahad* of His council” (1QS 3:5–6). G. Holtz, “Purity Conceptions in the Dead Sea Scrolls: ‘Ritual-Physical’ and ‘Moral’ Purity in a Diachronic Perspective”, in C. Frevel/C. Nihan (ed.), *Purity and the Forming of Religious Traditions in the Ancient Mediterranean World and Ancient Judaism* (Dynamics in the History of Religion 3; Leiden Brill, 2013) 519–36, on pp. 523–4, rightly stresses that, according to the passage, neither ritual nor moral purity can be obtained by human efforts and rituals, but by God’s spirit.

precisely in order to address the threat of blurred boundaries and defectors, or at least developed in that direction.

Another relevant body of evidence to investigate is the strong thread in the *Community Rule* (both the 1QS and 4QS^{b,d} manuscripts) on demanding *separation*, especially in relation to the group called the “people of injustice”. I shall turn next to this evidence and the question of how to interpret these rules in light of the black sheep effect and the outgroup homogeneity effect. Here 1QS will be compared to the parallel tradition in 4QS^d.

People of Injustice in Community Rule: Outgroup, or Ingroup Deviants?

The “people of injustice” in the *Community Rule* represent the outgroup since ingroup members needed to be separated from them. However, the matter is not quite this simple. Scholars have noticed that this group is presented ambiguously as comparable to former members or to novices who do not yet have full status and may err.³⁹ Is this group actually part of the ingroup but presented in strong negative terms (as in the black sheep effect) since they act against the central group norms, or does the title represent the outgroup with whom boundaries need to be established? Both options are possible, but I shall argue that the latter is more likely, at least in the 1QS tradition.

First, I suggest that such rules in the *Community Rule* are not (only) reflective of *denotive* norms on the basis of which the group identity was established, as opposed to the outgroup, but rather of *prescriptive* norms for maintaining positive social identity in the face of threats, blurred boundaries, and norm-violations. The evidence in the *Community Rule* can be read as efforts to manage reactions to ingroup deviants as well as accentuating the outgroup homogeneity in situations where ambiguity may have prevailed, in terms of responding to deviance and determining in relation to which matters ingroup and outgroup members should be distinguished.

In the first place, the people of injustice are encountered in the basic opening statement of 1QS 5//4QS^{b,d}:⁴⁰

³⁹ Hempel, “The Community and Its Rivals According to the Community Rule from Caves 1 and 4”, 47–81, and discussion therein. Hempel notes (p. 57): “Some of the language (touching the purity, wealth, law, judgment) is reminiscent of the admission process — cf. 1QS VI,13b–23 — almost as though we are dealing with reversal of that process.”

⁴⁰ This is partly comparable to CD 15, which gives regulations about the oath and the teaching but does not demand any separation.

4QS^d)4Q258) frg. 1a i, 1b 1–2 (par.

1QS 5:1–2

Q256 frg. 4 1–2)

Instruction for the *maskil*⁴¹ concerning the people of the *torah* who volunteer to turn from all evil, and to hold fast to all that He has commanded, and to separate themselves⁴² from the company⁴³ of the people of injustice (אנשי) (להבדל מעדת העול) to be a *yahad* (ליחד) in law and possessions.

This is the rule for the people of the *yahad* who volunteer to turn from all evil, and to hold fast to all that He, by His good will, has commanded, and to separate themselves from the company of the people of injustice (אנשי העול) (להבדל מעדת) to be together (ליחד) in law and possessions.

Separation is at the heart of the collective identity of the covenanters: at the same time as they are to be united in law and wealth, they are to separate themselves (or be separated) from people of injustice.⁴⁴ This characterizes the shared group beliefs in relation to which the ingroup members perceive themselves *vis-a-vis* the outgroup, but it also outlines more conscious, prescriptive norms legitimizing the differentiation. How clear was it in each setting who belonged to the people of injustice and what the existence of the *yahad* meant in terms of law and possessions? In the following passage, what this separation meant is more clearly laid out and expanded on. Let us first look at the shorter 4QS^d manuscript.

And everyone who enters the council of [the *yaha*]*d* shall t[a]ke upon himself with a binding oath to [return t]o the [t]*orah* of Mos[es] with all (his) heart and with all (his) soul (regarding) everything revealed from the t[*orah*, in accordance] with [the opinion of] the council of the peop[le] of the *yaha*[*d*, and to be separated from all the people of] injustice (אנשי העול). [T]hey shall not touch (pl. לא יגעו) the purity of the people of [holine]ss. Let no one eat (sg. ואל יוכל) with him (אתו) in [the *yahad*. No one (ואשר לא)] of the people of the *yahad* [shall give answer] in accordance with their opinion relating to any [*torah*] or judgement. [He (ואשר לא)] shall not be united with him in possessions or in] work. Let no one (ואל) of the people of holiness eat [from their possessions, n]o[r (ולא)] take from their hand anythin]g. They shall not depend (pl. לא ישענו) on [any of the wor]ks of vanity

⁴¹ R. Hawley, “On *Maskil* in the Judean Desert Texts”, *Henoch* 28, no. 2 (2006) 43–77, arguing that the translation of *maskil* should instead communicate the titular use of the term, suggests an alternate translation: “A lesson. For insight” (p. 69).

⁴² Nif. could also be interpreted passively as ‘to be separated from’.

⁴³ This is the only place where people of injustice are characterized with the term עדה. Whether this signifies an established, organized (institutional) group (‘congregation’) or looser meaning of ‘company’ of people is not clear. Here, the looser translation is preferred.

⁴⁴ Similarly, see Hempel, “The Community and Its Rivals”, 52, 59.

(הבל), for vanity are all who [do not know His covenant, and all who despi]se His word He shall blot out from the world, and their works are a defilem[ent] bef[ore Him, and in al]l [their possessions is impurity.] [...]m nations. Oaths and bans and vows in their mouths [...] (4Q258 frg. 1a i, 1b 5–12)

The separation rules are very practical. The rules mostly seem to be addressed to the one entering the covenant or to those already inside, and the rules of separation concern purity and meals, law and judgment, possessions and work. The negative view of the people of injustice comes to the fore only in the designation itself and possibly at the end of the section, which pronounces judgment on all who do not know the covenant and represent vanity.

However, the language demands a closer look. Whereas the passage begins with rules for the one entering the *yahad* fellowship, there is inconsistency in the use of the singular and plural forms, as well as the use of the אָל+jussive and אָל+imperfect. In three places, the pronoun וְאִשֵּׁר appears at the beginning of the sentence.⁴⁵ The sentence “*they* shall not touch the purity of the people of [holine]ss” first stands out from its context with its plural verbal form. There are two options to interpret this: 1) the sentence refers to the preceding people of injustice who are not to touch the purity of the people of holiness, or 2) the sentence concerns the entrants who are not yet fully authorized members in terms of communal purity (cf. 1QS 6:15–23; 8:16b–17).⁴⁶ In light of the multi-stage entrance and re-entrance processes found elsewhere, it is conceivable that this rule originally referred to the novice (perhaps in the singular, as in 1QS; see below), but in this context came to refer to outsiders – or was added to make a link to the multi-stage process. Most translators choose the first option without discussing the second. For example, Charlotte Hempel explains that this sentence bans the people of injustice from having any pure table-fellowship with members, and the following sentence, “let no one eat (sg.) with him in the *yahad*,” forbids taking less formal meals together, outside of the communal

⁴⁵ However, the first one (4Q258 frg. 1a i, 1b 7) is partly reconstructed, with *waw* in the beginning, but the preserved trace in the parallel 4QS^b (4Q256 frg. 4 8) could, in my view, equally be read as part of an *alef* (thus only וְאִשֵּׁר). The second one (4Q258 frg. 1a i, 1b 8) is completely reconstructed in 4QS^d (4Q258), but finds support in 4QS^b (4Q256 frg. 4 9). The third one (4Q258 frg. 1a i, 1b 9) lacks the end.

⁴⁶ The term “people of holiness” would then represent the full members of the movement. In this interpretation, the whole passage could be read as referring to the novice whose property and knowledge are not yet part of the communal pool, and they should not be used as such (see 1QS 6:17–23 and compare CD 15:10–11, which prohibits sharing knowledge about the laws with a novice). However, this reading seems to presuppose the long two-year entrance process, which is not preserved in 4QS^d (4Q258). Alternatively, if the passage speaks of the people of injustice, the sentence “let no one of the people of holiness eat [from their possessions, n]o[r take from their hand anythin]g” can be understood as a stricter rule for full members, in distinction to the novices who were perhaps still allowed to accept gifts from outsiders.

setting.⁴⁷ Furthermore, the later sentence “let no one of the people of holiness eat from their possessions, nor take from their hand anything” concerns a different issue, the mixing of property and benefitting from the (wealthier?) people of injustice.⁴⁸

The other plural form in the end of the passage “*they* shall not depend on [any of the wor]ks of vanity...” can only be addressed to ingroup members or members becoming as such, since vanity is associated with all who do not know (and do not enter) the covenant. If the first “they” is understood to refer to the outgroup (the people of injustice) and the second “they” to the ingroup, the mixture of singular and plural forms is nevertheless present in the passage; one cannot interpret the text as running smoothly but has to determine the subject in each case. The plural forms of the final sentence “oaths and bans and vows in their mouths”, which is only preserved in 4QS^d and not found in 1QS, is again interesting and ambiguous from this perspective: are these false oaths, bans, and vows in the mouths of the people of injustice, or are these desired commitments in the mouths of the ingroup members, possibly not to be shared with or heard by members of the outgroup?

For Hempel, the ambiguity as to who the opponents really are points towards their closeness to the covenanters (at least some of them), or possibly closeness in the past.⁴⁹ If the latter, it raises the possibility that the people of injustice were at one point seen to be “on the same side” with the covenanters, but later seen as deviating, to the extent that they needed to be separated. These sections in the *Community Rule* would then have been largely targeted against a particular outgroup.⁵⁰

Let us go back to the beginning of the section. That the novice took the oath is usually taken as referring to the ingroup and outgroup distinction: ingroup members took the oath when coming together, whereas (presumably) the people

⁴⁷ There nevertheless remains the problem of the plural and singular: the people of injustice would have been referred to both by the plural (“*they* shall not touch”) and the singular (one should not “eat with *him*”). Whether the latter sentence could have also been connected to the novice is uncertain, but conceivable: it would have banned the entrant from touching the purity of full members and from eating together with a member in the *yahad* (until granted full membership).

⁴⁸ Hempel, “The Community and Its Rivals”, 47–81, on pp. 52–4.

⁴⁹ Hempel, “The Community and Its Rivals”, 53, 57, 80: “physical and/or institutional closeness at one point” (p. 80).

⁵⁰ A similar scenario has often been suggested for the “liar” figure and his company in the *pesharim*, e.g. F. García Martínez/A.S. van der Woude, “A ‘Groningen’ Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History”, *RevQ* 14 (1990) 521–41; L.H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1994), 232. However, the outgroup in S does not need to be an organized, competitive, or schismatic outgroup. The mere closeness in everyday interaction with these people was the cause for the need for separation. If the people of injustice remained in close proximity with the covenanters, with several points of continuing contact, separation was needed merely for the ingroup to preserve its sense of superiority and distinctiveness.

of injustice did not. Whether this was a one-time occasion or repeated is not certain from this context (but cf. CD 15 where children take the oath when they come of age). However, what if the people of injustice also had taken the oath or been part of the fellowship but were seen as having broken it, due to some serious norm-deviance? How would the passage read then?

In this type of reading of the passage, the emphasis is on two directions that an ideal member is to follow: turning towards the *torah*, in the right counsel of the people of the *yahad*, and turning away from the people of injustice, who have committed some form of breach and are excluded from this council. Possibly there was a fear of being lured onto their suspicious path.⁵¹ This type of reading may become more compelling if one reads the relative pronoun without the *waw*:⁵²

...to be separated from all the people of] ולהבדל מכל אנשי העול [א] שֹׁר לא יגעו
 לטהרת [הקדש] ש אנשי justice who shall not touch the purity of
 e people of [holine]ss. 4QS^d (4Q258) frg.
 i, 1b 7–8⁵³

This would indicate that people of injustice are separated from purity, so one should also be separated from them. Such people were then associated with vanity: they may have become part of the movement, but in truth they “do not know His covenant”. Possibly their reintegration back into the movement had failed: they “despise His word”. In this interpretation, the question arises, if these are people who can still re-enter full fellowship, or if they are lost cases, people who can no longer re-enter. *The language of “injustice” in 1QS is associated both with the initial turning away from injustice upon admission (1QS 6:13–15)⁵⁴ and with repentance and cleansing of one’s injustice when a*

⁵¹ Note that in CD 15:7–10, the rule on the oath is very similar to 1QS as regards turning to the *torah*; however, CD completely lacks the rule on separation.

⁵² See [footnote 45](#) above.

⁵³ The closest parallel is found in 1QS 8:17, which provides instruction on the re-entrance of a deviant member: before being cleansed “from all injustice (עול),” the deviant member must not touch the purity of the people of holiness (אל יגע בטהרת אנשי הקודש). Cf. 1QS 6:16–17 regarding the rule on a novice (during the first year of the two years process): לוא יגע בטהרת הרבים; 1QS 7:19 rule on the re-entrance of a deviant member (during the first year of the two-year process): לוא יגע בטהרת הרבים.

⁵⁴ The more general statement also notes the separation from the people of injustice: “And when these are [in Israel,] they shall be separated fr[om the midst of the settlement of] the people [of injustice (אנשי העול), in order to prepare the way of the Lord in the wilderness. This is the study of the Tor]ah...” (4Q258 frg. 3a–d 6–7, par. 1QS 8:12–15).

member (1QS 8:16–19⁵⁵; 9:8–9⁵⁶). In a setting where members came together to meet, “membership” should not be understood as an on/off thing, proven by a “membership card”, but rather as related to the sharing of property, the right of speech in decision-making, and the transfer of knowledge – i.e. participation in “doing politics” to varying degrees. The concerns of the whole passage reveal that contacts not only took place in (formal) assembly meetings and meals, but that everyday life included opportunities to mix with these people, exchange views, do business, and have a meal with them.

The above discussion suggests at least three options for the general framework of the passage: the passage speaks of a novice (especially if the two-year process was followed) not yet in full fellowship standing and whose property and knowledge should thus not be mixed with that of the ingroup; the passage speaks of an outgroup, which has to be kept apart; or the passage speaks of deviant ingroup members who have possibly failed to be reintegrated back into the movement. Despite the ambiguities and incongruences of the passage, the general impression is that matters of separation have to do with material items associated with purity, concrete behaviour, and everyday practices. The shared knowledge acquired in the assemblies and the shared property enjoyed in the fellowship were not supposed to be accessible by any outsider or excluded insider. The *outgroup homogeneity effect* becomes pronounced at the end of the passage, as all those who stand outside this special sharing of knowledge and communion, are to be labelled as defiled in their works and possessions.

An even longer description about the people of injustice and what the separation entailed comes to the fore in 1QS. Any possible ambiguity is, to say the least, much weaker here: people of injustice are characterized as inherently the opposite of an ideal ingroup member and in no position to avoid judgment any longer. I have added titles to the four subsections in order to show their main contents:

(a) *Entrants into covenant must separate from people of injustice who bring upon themselves the curses of the covenant*

Each one who thus enters the covenant by oath is to separate himself from all of the people of injustice (להבדל מכול אנשי העול), they who walk in the wicked way, for such are not reckoned a part of His covenant. They “have not sought Him nor inquired of His statutes” (Zeph 1:6) so as to discover the hidden laws in which they err to their shame. Even the revealed laws they knowingly transgress, thus stirring God’s judgmental wrath and full vengeance: the

⁵⁵ A parallel is found in 4QS^d (4Q258) frgs. 3a–d 8–10.

⁵⁶ A parallel is found in 4QS^d (4Q258) frgs. 4a i and 4b 7–9. However, the sentence in 1QS 9:8–9 again is ambiguous, as the “people of rebellion who have failed to cleanse their path by separating from injustice (עול)” could also be seen as outsiders.

curses of the Mosaic covenant. He will bring against them weighty judgments, eternal destruction with none spared. *vacat* (1QS 5:10b–13a)

(b) People of injustice/insincere member/novice (?) are not to be purified

Let him (sg. וְאֵל) not enter purifying waters to touch the purity of the people of holiness. Indeed, it is impossible to be purified without first turning away from evil, since impurity adheres to all who transgress His word. (1QS 5:13b–14a)

(c) Covenanters (?) are not to mix with people of injustice (?) in work, wealth, or judgment

No one (וְאֵשֶׁר לֹא) is to be united (יִיחַד) with him in his work or wealth, lest “he cause him to bear guilt” (Lev 22:16). On the contrary, one must keep far from him in every respect, for thus it is written: “Keep far from every false thing” (Exod 23:7).⁵⁷ No one (וְאֵשֶׁר לֹא) belonging to the *yahad* is to discuss with them matters of *torah* or legal judgment. No one (וְאֵשֶׁר לֹא) is to eat or drink what is theirs, nor to take anything from them unless purchased, as it is written “Turn away from mere mortals, in whose nostrils is only breath; for of what account are they?” (Isa 2:22). (1QS 5:14b–17)

(d) Non-covenanters and vanity (≈people of injustice?) must be separated out

Accordingly, all who are not reckoned as belonging to His covenant must be separated out (כֹּל אֲשֶׁר לֹא נִחְשָׁבוּ בְּבְרִיתוֹ לְהַבְדִּיל אוֹתָם), along with everything they possess. A person of holiness must not depend on works of vanity (הַבֵּל), for vanity (הַבֵּל) are all who do not know His covenant, and all who despise His word, He shall blot out from the world, and their every work is a defilement before Him, and in all their possessions is impurity. (1QS 5:18–20a)

The passage again preserves several types of rules, which are woven together. The first section (a) contains the main accusation against the people of injustice: they are not interested in finding out God’s will, and even when they know it, they do not hesitate to ignore it and go their own way. The second section (b) bans one⁵⁸ from entering into the same purification waters as the people of holiness, and it denies the efficacy of their purification in general. The third

⁵⁷ The context of the Exodus quotation refers to several offences of twisting justice against the poor and the innocent.

⁵⁸ The addressee remains ambiguous here: is it a person belonging to the people of injustice, an insincere member (cf. 1QS 2:11–18), or a member refusing to enter with others (cf. 1QS 2:25b–3:12a)? Note the singular in comparison to the plural in the 4QS^d version “they shall not touch” (see above).

section (c) again addresses a covenanter (or covenanter-to-be) and bans him from uniting with the people of injustice (although not explicitly named) in any matter connected to work, wealth, law, judgment, and meals. This section is notable for its many scriptural quotations. The fourth section (d) plays with the similarity of the words עוֹל ‘injustice’ and הַבֵּל ‘vanity’, as did the parallel in 4QS^d, and it instructs a person of holiness to actively separate – not himself this time but non-covenanters; it is about the covenanter creating distance, not taking distance.

In comparison to the 4QS^d version, sections (a) and (b) provide more information.⁵⁹ The characterization in section (a) gives further criteria for identifying whom to separate from and how to call them: the ignorant and the cursed. This emphasis strongly suggests seeing these people as outgroup members, inherently wicked and doomed. *Separation is also ideological*, not only physical or material. This sort of material in 1QS is often interpreted as later additions and reworkings.⁶⁰ If so, they provide extra evidence for the homogeneity effect and polarization of the outgroup. In the setting of 4QS^d where an ingroup member would have been advised to be careful not to share communal treasures (knowledge and righteous sharing of property) with those who were not fully part of the movement, the ingroup member could have acknowledged at least some variation in the outgroup members’ behaviour and standing. But when the separation came to be determined by the inherent properties of the outgroup members, ingroup members were more strongly invited to see the outsiders as all inherently and essentially the same.

Section (b) not only contains the ban on touching the purity of the people of holiness, as in 4QS^d, but it explicates that the ban is about entering into their waters.⁶¹ Differing from many translations, it is possible to again read here that the rule applies to the entrant into the covenant who is not yet a full member and is forbidden from entering the water with full members. The principle behind this is one according to which whoever breaks the rules must first repent and only then be re-established in his membership (1QS 7:18–21; 8:16–19). However, the last characterization in this section, “since impurity adheres to all

⁵⁹ Hempel, “The Community and Its Rivals”, 47–81, has discussed at length the rivalry groups in the S traditions and compares in detail the 4QS and 1QS differences. She points out the continuity shown by these manuscripts: even though there are considerable differences between 1QS and 4QS, the injunction to separate from people of injustice is remarkably similar and consistent.

⁶⁰ Metso, *The Textual Development*.

⁶¹ C. Hempel, “Who is Making Dinner at Qumran?”, *JTS* 63, no. 1 (2012) 49–65, argues that “touching the purity” did not necessarily indicate a meal context but involvement with other pure items as well. C. Wassén, “Common Meals in the Qumran Movement with Special Attention to Purity Regulations”, in D. Hellholm/D. Sænger (ed.), *The Eucharist – Its Origins and Contexts: Sacred Meal, Communal Meal, Table Fellowship in Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity. Vol. 1* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck) 55–78, argues that not all (ordinary) meals in the movement required full purity.

who transgress His word”, seems to take this one step further: the person does not repent because he is (inherently) impure. Thus this section is associated with the people of injustice who in the previous section were already seen as cursed by the covenant.

Besides scriptural quotations that emphasize the argument, section (c) also includes one significant element in comparison to 4QS^d: the rule not “to take anything from them *unless purchased*”. This seems to be a more lenient position, as noted by Hempel,⁶² as every exchange with the people of injustice was not banned but buying was allowed. Another clear difference is that all the rules of separation are lumped together and addressed to one from the *yahad*, unlike in 4QS^d where the first rules (regarding knowledge and judgment, work and wealth) were addressed to one from the *yahad*, and then the subsequent rule (regarding eating or taking) was for one of the people of holiness.⁶³ Instead, the people of holiness appear in 1QS in the last section (d). If there was once a distinction in the tradition between a novice and a full member,⁶⁴ at least in the 1QS version it does not appear to be present.

In conclusion, 4QS^d is already seen as made up of several rules brought together into a new whole. It not only includes practical arrangements of whom to allow to participate in communal decision-making and provisions, but further essentialization and condemnation of the actions of outgroup/excluded ingroup members. 1QS contains even more markers towards this tendency: the community’s neighbours were now labelled as people of injustice, who were painted as inherently ignorant and intentionally sinful, thus drawing curses upon themselves. They were also unable to purify themselves and repent, suspected of twisting justice, to be avoided in order not to bear their guilt, and they carried defilement and impurity in all their deeds and things.⁶⁵ Even though such labelling may have started with viewing ingroup deviant members more harshly than outgroup members, in an attempt to preserve the positive distinctiveness of the ingroup, it came to serve as the overall perception of outgroup members as clearly worth separating from. Thereafter, explicit rules regarding the deviant ingroup member (studied at the beginning) were designed to more clearly manage attitudes towards ingroup deviants in situations where outside relationships were already highly regulated but assembly rules and temporary exclusions were insufficient to address the problem of such deviants: intentional

⁶² Hempel, “The Community and Its Rivals”, 54.

⁶³ In contrast, the rule in 1QS 9:8–9 explicitly mentions the people of holiness: the wealth of the *people of holiness* was “not to be admixed with that of the people of rebellion (אנשי הרמיה), who have failed to cleanse their path by separating from injustice (להבדל מעול)”.

⁶⁴ Or between a normal member and an elite member, as suggested by Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, 69–75.

⁶⁵ H.K. Harrington, *The Purity Texts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 5; London: T&T Clark International, 2004), 117, notes the power of such labelling through impurity language.

sinner were also found inside the movement⁶⁶ and even a senior member could fail to meet expectations.

Conclusions

This study has sought to understand the evidence of attitudes towards norm-deviant behaviour in a setting where Qumran movement members most likely lived among non-members and former members.⁶⁷ The context in which separation from the “people of injustice” was demanded implied everyday interaction between covenanters and non-covenanters, which in normal circumstances meant doing business with them, having meals with them, exchanging views and opinions with them, etc. Problems could have arisen when ingroup members did not see the outgroup and ingroup members as sufficiently different as regards their following of the *torah*; perhaps interaction risked ownership of the right view on *torah*, either when ingroup deviants blurred the boundaries or when deserters threatened the legitimacy and positive distinctiveness of the ingroup.

The passages studied here provide some clues to understanding how ingroup members were meant to evaluate themselves and outgroup members in different situations, as well as what manuscripts like 4QS^d and 1QS sought to do in managing the attitudes, opinions, and behaviour of ingroup members. In some other passages, deviance and separation do not play a similarly important role. For example, the famous characterization in 1QS 6 only outlines togetherness, not separation: “Together they shall eat, together they shall bless, together they shall exchange counsel” (1QS 6:2b–3a). Furthermore, the emphasis in many places is on the *hierarchy among* ingroup members (one is “more in” than some other members), not the distinction between ingroup and outgroup members. In this regard, the rules of separation from the people of injustice contributed to creating shared attitudes about outgroup members, accentuating their difference, and seeing all of them as equally avoidable. Discrimination towards outgroup members served the various purposes of creating a sense of virtual power, clear-cut and secure group identity, and confidence in the ingroup.

The exact person concerned in some of the passages studied here –novice, insincere member, deviant member, outsider – is not entirely clear. This ambiguity (or at least the similarity in the statements) suggests that such traditions were flexible and adjusted to various needs. The possibility that the

⁶⁶ The rule on intentional and unintentional sin was also part of the 4QS^d tradition: 4QS^d (4Q258) 3a–d 8–12; 4a i and 4b 1–3 preserves some words in parallel to the rules in 1QS 8:16–27.

⁶⁷ To live as a celibate among fellow celibates in a closed environment is another matter than to live as a family member in a city or village but trying to remain segregated from others. The scholarly image of the Qumran movement has clearly moved from the first image more towards the second.

designation “people of injustice” at some point or in some contexts referred to ingroup members (either those who were excluded for a period or expelled altogether) was explored here. It was found to be possible but not necessarily compelling in 4QS^d and less likely for 1QS, where the people of injustice were portrayed as inherently possessing undesirable properties.

The ambiguity, however, may also suggest that separation was seen as never fully completed but a continuous process: first, a person had to learn the ideal of always turning to the *torah* and separating from those people who, doing the opposite, followed injustice. As one learned this, one also learned about the greater range of situations where this applied, and the greater variety of ingroup members and their ability to achieve these ideals. There is always anxiety about not finding neat categories in real life.⁶⁸ Such anxieties would have been addressed by a further outgroup homogeneity effect: seeing outgroup members as increasingly similar to each other, often in terms of their worst example, and thus perceiving their inner character as a permanent, natural essence of sinfulness and impurity.

In that kind of situation, the black sheep effect – seeing ingroup deviants more negatively than the corresponding outgroup members – produced tangible rules about how and when to punish the deviant member, in order to preserve the credibility of the ingroup and its being perceived as attractive as possible. These rules were interested not in separation, but rather the reintegration of the member who could be excused (unintentional sinner or junior member) and expulsion of the member who had no excuse (intentional sinner or senior member). The annual covenant ritual (1QS 1:1–3:12) may also be significant from this perspective. Even the deviant member was required to participate in the restoration of covenant relationship, repentance, and ranking – if he did not, he would be an outsider. Furthermore, the inclusion of the two spirits discourse in the S literature (1QS 3:13–4:26) added another unique and strong layer of perceiving humanity as divided into two distinct categories, as defined by their internal essences.

⁶⁸ That there was indeed a need to *teach* what separation meant is seen in the instructions found in the final section of 1QS (titled with למשכיל, 1QS 9:12–10:4) and the hymn in the first person (1QS 10:4–11:22): the ideal member “should conceal the counsel of the *torah* (4QS^d reads “his counsel”) when among the people of injustice (אנשי העול) (1QS 9:17) and “teach them to separate from everyone who fails to turn his way from injustice (עול והבדל מכול איש ולוא הסר דרכו מכול) (1QS 9:20–21).

